

REMARKS

Claims 30-49 remain in this application. Claims 10-29 are canceled. Claims 30-49 are added to more distinctly claim and particularly point out the invention. By these amendments, no new matter has been added.

Claims 10-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §§ 103(a) and 112. In order to expedite allowance, the rejected claims are canceled, without disclaimer and without prejudice. These rejections are respectfully traversed. All of these rejections are moot in view of the newly added claims, all of which define limitations that have not yet been considered by the Examiner. These rejections should therefore be withdrawn. The patentability of the newly added claims is discussed below.

As described in the specification, the invention enables the use of domain names that appear to be fully qualified domain names, but in fact, are not. The unqualified domain names can be used in URL's for directly requesting content from a host server. The invention eliminates the disadvantages associated with fully qualified domain names, such as the expense of maintaining IP addresses and latency time for new domain names, while retaining many of their advantages, such as simplicity.

For example, the invention defines a system and method whereby a user can make use of a domain name that appears to be qualified, such as the name "user.host.com," as a URL for content that would otherwise have to be identified as "host.com/path/user.htm." The host that maintains the fully-qualified domain name "host.com" is thereby able to provide the benefits of its name to a large number of subscribers. Each subscriber, in turn, may essentially "carve out" his or her own subdomain within the host site, without any need to register or to maintain an IP address. When the host receives a URL containing a user-selected domain name, the host determines the correct content address based on the user-selected subdomains, and serves the content at that address as though from a fully-qualified domain. The requestor of the content need not be aware that the user's domain name is not fully

qualified.

The references of record, both separately, and in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the invention as defined by Claims 30-49. Broadhurst does not concern anything other than fully-qualified domain names. Broadhurst merely discloses a method for determining whether a particular subdomain label is already reserved in the zone file of higher-level domains. A user desiring to make use of a particular subdomain label is therefore required to register it as a qualified domain name in each desired higher-level domain. Broadhurst fails to disclose or suggest numerous limitations of the invention, including, for example, "configuring a content address according to a content storage system of the host computer independently of the domain name system," as defined by Claims 30 and 41. Nor do any of the other cited references make up for these deficiencies of Broadhurst. Claims 30-49 are therefore believed to be allowable over Broadhurst and the other references cited in combination with it.

Likewise, other references of record fail to disclose or suggest the invention. The "Report on Electronic Commerce" merely mentions that "[t]hird and fourth-level domain names are also possible . . . but their existence is a local matter." The Report fails to disclose or suggest, among other things, the use of an independent content storage system, a wildcard character in an internet-class resource record, and determining a content address from a user-selected subdomain label to serve content in response to receiving a domain name, as defined by Claims 30 and 41. Instead, the Report on Electronic Commerce discloses nothing more than numerous other references of record, namely, the use of individually-selected account names in e-mail addresses. However, the prior-art use of e-mail account names does not anticipate or make obvious the invention. E-mail fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations summarized above. In a nutshell, e-mail concerns the receiving and storing of e-mail messages for later viewing by an authorized user. E-mail does not concern serving user-designated content in response to a URL that includes a domain name.

Serial No. 09/386,529
August 8, 2003
Page 10

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 30-49 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested, and a timely Notice of Allowability is solicited.

To the extent it would be helpful to placing this application in condition for allowance, the Applicants encourage the Examiner to contact the undersigned counsel and conduct a telephonic interview.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition the Commissioner for a one-month extension of time, extending to August 8, 2003, the period for response to the Office Action dated April 8, 2003. A check in the amount of \$55.00 is enclosed for the one-month extension of time pursuant to 37 CFR §1.17(a)(1) and \$375.00 with the accompanying request for continued examination (RCE) pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.17(e). In addition, the Commissioner is authorized to charge \$55.00 and any shortage in the fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-0639.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: August 8, 2003

Brian M. Berliner
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 34,549

O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
400 South Hope Street
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2899
Telephone: (213) 430-6000